Previous references.

File No. 173 of 08

1908-9

Serial Nos. 1 to 5

(courts)

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1 to 5

Part B. for April 09.

SUBJECT.

Requisitions by the civil courts for palace papers or documents

Table of Contents

1. From The Private Secretary to ~~his~~ H.H. D.O.No. 61 dt 5.
States that considerable inconvenience is felt by the Palace in complying with the requisitions received from the civil courts for documents which are retained by the courts for considerable periods.
2. To the Regr. Chief Court, No. 9 1523 dt 27-11-08
Requests, that necessary instructions may be issued to the courts concerned, requiring them to specify the documents they require & to accept as sufficient copies of abstracts signed by the Palace officer.

G. R. S. 58

3. From the Regr., chief court No. 3529/187 dt 5-12-08

Enquires what kind of papers are referred to in the above letter, whether they are Govt or Private records - and for what purpose they are required by the courts

4 To the Regr., chief Court, No J 2716 dt 13-3-09

Forwards abstracts of three typical cases & a copy of a D.O from the officer in charge of Palace establishment explaining the matter in detail

5 From the Regr., chief court, No. 5929/303 dt 7-4-09.

States that certified copies of Palace accounts would not be admissable in evidence & proposes to request the District Judge of Nuzvid to impress upon subordinate Courts the necessity for minimising the inconveniences by severely discouraging general requisitions referred to above.

To the Private Secretary of H.H..D.O No J 3247 dt 23/4/09

Communicating, the action proposed to be taken by the chief court..

1

G. R. S. 11] 190 .

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

(Courts)

NOTES.

Cts File. No 173-08

FILE HEADING.

Requisitions by the Civil Courts for Palace papers and documents.

From

The Private Secretary to H H the Maharaja of Mysore.

DO. No. 61 Dated 5.11.08 Received 8.11.08

Diary No. 1235	Enclos. nil Spare Copies.	Serial No. 1

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

States that considerable inconvenience is felt by the Palace in complying with the requisitions received from the Civil Courts for documents which are retained by the Courts for considerable periods.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

The Private Secretary states that the Palace is quite prepared to meet the requisitions of the Courts in so far as the ends of justice require. But he says that the requisitions

NOTES—First sheet.

MGCPB—30,000—17-2-05.

Serial No.

are of an indefinite nature and consequently a lot of confidential matter has to be produced before the Courts. We suggest that Courts when making requisitions should be required to specify clearly what items of accounts or specific documents they require and that copies or Extracts certified by the Officer in charge of Palace Establishments should be accepted as sufficient.

TM
10/4/08

Palace ~~accounts~~ and papers are [redacted] no doubt "official records relating to affairs of State," within the meaning of Sec. 123 of the Indian Evidence Act; and therefore evidence based on such documents can only be given with the permission of the Officer in charge of the Palace Establishments. Where he considers that the production of any particular paper or account, or the giving of copies thereof, is ~~detrimental~~ injurious to the public interests, he is at liberty to refuse compliance.

In his present communication, the District

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000—13-5-08

Serial No.

Secretary to H.H. does not warrant any ~~extension~~ enlargement of this privilege. He merely desires that Courts should be specific in their requisitions, and also not insist on the officials being produced when the Palace Office is prepared to grant certified copies or extracts.

The request is a reasonable one, and as it relates to a mere matter of procedure, it can, I believe, be given effect to by instructions issued by the Chief Court to Courts subordinate to it.

If approved, the Chief Justice will be unofficially consulted before a formal reference is made—

Dewan the 10/11/08

11.11.08

No 8735-
11-11-08

10/11/08
11/11/08

Dewan's ado

11/11
Chief
11/11

This may be done

lee
15-11-08

H.O. J 86
16.11.08

Forwarded unofficially to the Chief Justice of Mysore for favour of remarks—

16.11.08

Chiefs office
Lee to Sir

Read
16-11-08

Note—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50.000—13-5-08

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

Ch File No. 173 of 1908-09.

Serial No.

No. 3174/160

The Chief Judge entirely concurs and will issue suitable orders when a formal reference is made.

17. 11. 08. Regr. Chief Ch.

Draft please —

Submitted with a draft to Chief Court.

Sd/ 19.11.08

Sd/ 19/11/08

This may be issued

Sd/ 20/11/08

Sd/ 20-11-08

Sd/ 21/11

The draft may be approved

Sd/ 23.11.08

Sd/ 23-11-08

Draft approved

Sd/ 27/11

Sd/ 26-11-08

Sd/ 26/11

2 To the Registrar of the Chief Court of Mysore No 1523 & 21.11.08.

Requests that necessary instructions may be issued to the Courts Concerned requiring them to specify the

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50.000—13-5-08

Serial No.

the documents they require and to accept as sufficient copies or extracts signed by the Palace Officer.

3 From the Registrar of the Chief Court
№ 35-29-187 S. 5.12.08.

Enquires what kind of papers are referred to in the above letter — whether they are Govt or Private records — and for what purpose they are required by the Courts.

Submitted for orders.

Secy SN
9.12.08

Secy

SP Chitre

The information asked for by the Chief Court is not given in the D.O. letter from the Private Secy dt. 8.8. So far as can be seen, the records in question appear to be those relating to the internal management of the Palace and not papers relating to the affairs of Govt. in the ~~Secretariat~~ Palace archives. The former would perhaps be liable to be regarded as private ~~documents~~ records.

It is not also clear in what

Note—Contn sheet.

Serial No.

connection palace records - whether public or private - are requisitioned by Courts. It is hardly likely that they are wanted in suits to which the Palace is a party. Very probably they are required as evidence in suits between private persons - possibly in such suits palace records maybe required as affording evidence.

It is a question whether having regard to the fact that His Highness the Maharaja is constitutionally the autocratic sovereign of the State & as such is beyond the jurisdiction of municipal Courts Palace records - whether of all kinds which are in his custody are not exempt from the process of Courts except to such extent as H. H. permits of his own accord -

The information asked for by the Chief Court maybe obtained from the Pte. Secy to H. H. either demi officially or unofficially -

C.S.B. 21/12/08

Secy) Yes, demi-officially. Vide draft put-up herewith. 22/12/08

V. Put up fair copy for Secy's signature

C.S.B. 22/12/08

Sus 31-12-08

21/12

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000—13-5-08

No 173-98

No J 1802 (encl)
Ch.

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

General and Revenue Secretariat,

Bangalore, 22d/23d December 1898

My dear Sir,

In your D.O. No 61 of the 5th Nov 1898 to the Dewan you referred to the inconvenience caused to the Palace by the practice of the Courts in regard to requisitions for Palace papers and accounts, etc.

A reference having been made to the Chief Court in the matter, I have received a

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPE—50,000—13-5-98

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 173 of 1908-09.

7

Serial No.

D.O. issued N° 9/1802 S 22.12.08.
No reply has yet been received. A D.O. reminder may perhaps be issued to the Private Secretary to H.H. the Maharaja. Subd for orders -

HCS 6/2/1909.

A polite D.O. letter may be written to the Private Secretary to H. H.

6.2.09 SH

Secretary

Not necessary. I think we may wait for the Mazeer's further communication

SH 11.2.09 CJB 10/2/09

D.O. letter from E. Macdonochie Esq. dcs. N° 101 S 1.3.1909.

Forwards abstracts of certain typical cases together with an extract of a D.O. from the Palace Officer

Submitted with a draft reply to Chief Court for approval or for other orders -

The draft may issue

2 Mch

HCS 2.3.09.

9.3.09. SH

CJB 3/3/09 Secretary.

Issue CJB

SH 10/3/09. 9/3/09

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50.000—13-5-08

G.R.S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. of 190

C.V. 179

The Palace, Bangalore,

1st March 1909.

J 2218

Dear Mr. Balasundaram Iyer

With reference to Mr.Chandrasekhara Iyer's D.O.No.J.1802 and enclosure, dated 22/23rd December 1908, I send herewith abstracts of three typical cases received from the Officer in charge of the Palace Establishments, with an extract from a covering D.O.* from that Officer. These papers will, I think sufficiently explain the position of affairs.

No.588/6/2 files D/ 26.2.09 from the Palace Officer, Mysore to the Assistant Private Secretary.

Yours sincerely

V Krishnamurthi

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50.000—18-5-08

Extract from D.O letter No.588/6/2files dated 26-2-09, from the Officer in charge of the Palace Estts.,Mysore,to the Assistant Private Secretary to H.H.the Maharaja of Mysore.

&&&&&&&&&&&&&&

" In compliance with the requisition therein made,I beg to submit herewith notes marked (A),(B),and (C) furnishing information in three typical cases to prove the position taken up in the interests of the Palace in regard to court requisitions for Palace accounts ,Documents &c.

The Registrar Chief Court in his letter to the Chief Secretary in reply to Government order contained in No.1523 of 27th November 1908,requests to be informed as to what kind of papers are referred to whether they are Government or Private records and for what purposes they are required by the Courts.

Our contention is that the courts generally do not state the purpose they ask papers &c for and do not specify what item of account or particular document is required. This is evident in case (C) referred to,Mr.Framji's affair,where I asked the Principal Munsiff to say if any particular letters or accounts are required and he has avoided answering this but has merely repeated summons and now at last calls on me to attend the court and why,he does not say. I happen to possess no personal knowledge of the matter. Please see my note 724 of this day's date submitted separately.

As to whether it is Govt or Private records the courts ask

ask for, I have to say that in general the Palace records which relate to His Highness' household and which at His Highness' pleasure embrace also the family affairs of many of the Rajabandhus &c are confidential in their nature and must be regarded as Privileged Documents. Hence it is that we say that if any specific requisitions are made for letters or accounts copies of such will be furnished duly authenticated provided they are of such a nature as to admit of this being done. Palace has its rules for service and pensions &c and work in it goes on methodically as in Government . So our authentication possesses value as much as that in Government Departments.

Case No.(B) shows what private and domestic documents were all intended to be interfered with by the Principal Munsiff. Please see list given in red ink at foot of that note.

File of papers referred to in note (C) goes to you today with my No.724. I also herewith send files relating to note(A) and note (B) to enable you to verify my remarks in them."

Serial No.

4 To The Registrar, Chief Court, No 2716 & 13 3-4
Forwards abstract of three typical Cases and a Copy of a Do. from the Officer in Charge of Palace Establishments explaining the matter in detail.

5 From the Same Officer, No 5929 & Do 3 7.4.09.

States that certified copies of Palace accounts would not be admissible in evidence and proposes to request the District Judge of Mysore to impress upon Subordinate Courts the necessity for minimizing the inconvenience by severely discouraging General requisitions of the kind referred to above.

Subd for orders.

13.4.09. The action proposed to be taken by the Chief Court may be Communicated to the Private Secretary to His Highness the Maharaja.

Draft Do. put up. 14/4. [illegible]

Secretary. In my humble opinion, Palace accounts are public documents; and the assumption that they are understood not to be public documents in the Registrar's letter

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000—13-5-06

Serial No.

seems inconsistent with the views accepted by the Chief Judge in my unofficial ref.ce of 16-11-08 (Vide page 2 6 4 of the note)

If, however, the views now advanced is the more correct one, then the draft D.O. put up by the Pleader may be approved, & the file duly may be sent to H.C.

Dehra Dun 22/4

14-4-09

26)

14/4/09

The later opinion of the Chief Court is one given on fuller consideration. If certified copies are to be admitted, a regulation will have to be passed making provision for it as has been recently done in the case of Bankers books, but I am doubtful of the necessity or expediency of such a measure. The D.O. reply proposed may, I think, be sent.

16/4/09

Draft approved

27/4/09

D.O Issued

No. 3247 dated 27/4/09

22/4.

276
17.4.09

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000—18-5-08

10

G.R.S. 26]

File No.

Serial No.

Diary No. of letter replied to

Draft D.O.

No. J 3247 Secy
& 23/4/09

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 190

Date of issue 23-4-09.

Signed by Sir Chandrasekhara Aiyar

To

Dear Sir,

Please refer to the correspondence ending with Mr. Mackenochie's D.O. dated the 1st March 1909 in re the production of the Civil Courts of Palace papers and accounts.

2. In reply I am desired to forward herewith a copy of letter No. 5929/303 dated the 7th April 1909 from the Registrar, Chief Court, intimating the action proposed to be taken in the matter.

The term "public documents" is there employed as defined in sec 74 of the Indian Evidence Act of 1872.

over.

Yours sincerely,

SUBJECT.

Secretary to Govt

To

R. H. Campbell Esqre I.C.S

Resident in Travancore

D.O. Room No: 1105-98-11-08

No 61

Secretary's Journal 7/11/08

PRIVATE SECRETARY MYSORE

J1235

Mysore,

5-11-8.

Dear Mr. Madhava Rao

His Highness desires me to address you with reference to requisitions by the Civil Courts for Palace papers and accounts. Requisitions are frequently received from the Courts for such documents and are complied with so far as is practicable. The result is very often considerable inconvenience to the Palace owing to account books &c being retained by the Courts for considerable periods, Further there are apparent objections to confidential Palace accounts being taken into Court and to confidential transactions of all kinds being thereby exposed to the curiosity of all and sundry. Again the Courts have a way of calling in general terms for "all the records connected with" a particular trans-

action. The Palace is quite prepared to meet the requisitions of the Courts in so far as the ends of Justice require. But strong exception is taken to producing papers, including a lot of confidential matter, which has nothing to do with the case at issue , and also to complying with requisitions of such an indefinite nature. I am to suggest that Courts when making requisitions should be required to specify clearly what items of account or specific documents they require, and that copies or Extracts certified by the Officer in charge of Palace Establishments should be accepted as sufficient.

I am to request that the matter may be fully considered and that His Highness may be informed whether it is practicable to give effect to this suggestion.

Yrs sincerely
E Macnaghten

No. J 1523 / Cts 173-08-2

Dated 27th Nov 08.

To

The Registrar of the Chief Court of
Mysore.

Sir,

I am directed to state that considerable inconvenience is reported to be experienced in the Palace, in complying with requisitions frequently made by the Civil Courts for Palace papers and accounts. These papers are often retained by such Courts for long periods of time and the requisitions are often of a very indefinite nature, being requests in general terms for the production of "all the records connected with" a particular transaction. With a view to prevent confidential Palace accounts being taken into court and retained there indefinitely and to prevent confidential Palace transactions of all kinds being exposed to the curiosity of all and sundry, Government consider it desirable that when making requisitions courts should be required to specify

clearly

3

clearly the items of accounts or the specific documents which they require and to accept as sufficient copies or extracts thereof certified by the Officer in Charge of Palace Establishments. I am to request therefore that the Chief Court may be moved to issue the necessary instructions in the matter and that a copy of such instructions may be furnished for the information of Government.

I have etc.,

(Fair draft)

Secretary to Govt.

M.L.
1

No 3529/187

Bangalore
5th December 1908.

From,

V.A.Rajaratna Mudaliar Esq.,

Registrar, Chief Court of Mysore.

To,

K.S.Chandrasekhara Aiyar Esq.,

Secretary to the Govt: of Mysore,

Genl: and Rev: Departments.

Sir,

With reference to your letter no.J.1523-Cts.173-08-2 dated, 27th November 1908 in the matter of issuing certain instructions about the production in Civil Courts of Palace papers and accounts, I am directed to request to be informed as to what kind of papers are referred to in the above-whether they are Government or private records- and for what purpose they are required by the Courts.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

REGISTRAR.

A.S.

2 4 5

G.R.S. 26]

G. File No. 173/08

Serial No. 4

Diary No. of letter replied to _____

No. J 2716

C.173/08-4

9/13-3-09

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

, *the* 190 .

To The Registrar of the
Chief Court of
Ellysere

Date of issue 13-3-09

Signed by Sir S Thiruvannaiya

Sir,

Adverting to your
letter No 3529 dated the
187
5th December 1908 calling
requesting to be furnished
with certain information
in the matter of issuing
instructions for the
guidance of the Civil
Courts in making
requisitions for the Palace
papers and accounts
I am directed to forward
herewith abstracts of

over.

SUBJECT.

6

1450

Three typical Cases received from the Officer in Charge of the Palace Establishments with an extract from a covering Do. from that Officer, which explain the matter ~~Officers~~ in detail.

I have &c.

[illegible]

for Secretary.

List of enclosures.

[illegible]
2.3.09.
[illegible]
1/3

Copied by [illegible] 11/3

Examined by [illegible]

MGCPB—30,000—16-2-05

No. 5929 Enc 3.
303

7th April 1909.

From

The Registrar,
Chief Court of Mysore.

To

The Secretary to Government,
Gen. and Rev. Departments.

Sir,

Adverting to your letter No. 2716
Cls 173-08-4
dated the 13th March 1909 in re summoning Palace accounts, I am directed to state that as Palace accounts are understood not to be public documents, certified copies would not, in the absence of special legislation, be admissible in evidence. It is proposed to direct the attention of the Mysore District Judge to the inconvenience now brought to notice and to ask him to impress upon Subordinate Courts the necessity for minimizing this inconvenience as far as possible. Counsel should be required to specify the particular document or the particular item of account, the production of which is desired and

and general requisitions should be severely discouraged.

The abstracts enclosed in your letter are returned.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,

Registrar.

Note (A) Page (1)

Nanjaraj Bahadur's Agrahar file.

No.	Court requisition.	Palace answer.
1	The Principal Munsiff of Mysore sent an attachment warrant for the amount held in deposit at the credit of Linigajammanni and belonging to the funds of Nanjaraj Bahadur. (Vide yadi No. 500 dated 23/24-11-04).	A reply was sent that there was no money in the Palace Treasury at the credit of Linigajammanni. (Vide yadast No. 148 Dt 8-12-04).
2	The Principal Munsiff of Mysore sent another attachment warrant of the above nature. (Vide yadi No. 620 Dt 28-12-04)	A reply was sent that there was no money in the Palace Treasury out of the Charity funds of Nanjaraja Bahadur (Vide yadi No. 176 Dt 7-1-05).
3	The Principal Munsiff sent summons to the Palace officer asking him to show cause why he should not be summoned to attend the Court with connected records regarding the amount held at the credit of Linigajammanni belonging to the funds of Nanjaraja Bahadur. (Vide Letter No. 603 Dt. 28-2-05).	Replied as follows: (Vide No. 1294 Dt 9-3-05). (1). Invited his attention to this office yadis Nos 148 & 176 Dt 8-12-04 & 7-1-05 respectively. (2). No references are available to show that there is any amount in the Palace Treasury belonging to the fund of the late Nanjaraj Bahadur. (3). File of papers connected with the Agrahar works of the late Nanjaraja Bahadur was sent to the late Mr. C. Rajaha Rao, Public Prosecutor, in Nov. 1908 and this has not been received back. (4). The Palace officer has no personal knowledge of the matter and so he is at a loss to understand why he should be summoned.
4	The Principal Munsiff wrote to say enquiring "if there is any reference in the accounts of the Palace about any amount having been deposited in that Treasury by the late Mr Nanjaraj Bahadur for charitable purposes. If any such deposit has been made you will be pleased to inform the Court how the amount has been disposed of."	A reply was sent with a list showing the amounts received at and paid in the Palace Treasury on account of the late Nanjaraja Bahadur's Agrahar works. (Vide Letter No 1479 of 18-4-05.

To

Note (A) Page (2)

No.	Court requisition	Palace answer
5	yadast No. 1349 dated 6-4-06 from the Principal munsiff, Mysore, requesting that extracts from the Palace accounts may be furnished to him showing the dates of several amounts received at and paid in the Palace Treasury.	The Principal munsiff was informed in this office yadi No. 417 of 2/11-6-06 that the extracts of accounts were already furnished to him with this office No. 1479 of 18-4-05.
6	yadast No. 1555 dated 13-6-06 from the Principal munsiff, Mysore, stating that facilities may be given to Court munshi Gopalakrishniah who has been appointed as a commissioner to examine the accounts of Nanjaraja Bahadur.	The Principal munsiff's attention was invited to this office Nos. 1479 & 417 dated 18-4-05 & 2/11-6-06 respectively. He was also requested to inform in detail whether the commissioner appointed by the court was going to examine the accounts furnished from this office.
7	The Principal munsiff sent summons to the Palace officer asking him to appear in person to the Court to give evidence with all the records connected with the funds of Nanjaraja Bahadur Agrahar works from 1893 to 1898. (Vide Letter No. 33 Dt/ 16-7-06)	Replied as follows:- (Vide No. 148 Dt/ 21/25-7-06) (1). Invited his attention to this office No. 148, 176, & 1294 Dt/ 8-12-04, 7-1-05 & 9-3-05 respectively (2). Repeated what was stated in the above.
8	Without making any reference to this office No. 148 Dt/ 21/25-7-06, the Principal munsiff again sent summons with his letter No. 202 of 16-10-06 repeating the request already made in his letter No. 33 Dt/16-7-06	Replied as follows:- (No. 697 of 18-10-06) (1). Invited his attention to the correspondence above quoted (2). The Palace officer has no personal knowledge of the matter and so he is at a loss to understand why he should be summo (3). Every endeavor will be made to have a further search made in the Palace Treasury if any more information is required besides what has been alre sent.
9	The Principal munsiff requested in his docket No. 267 of 30-11-06 to be informed whether there are any objection to allow petition Krishnaswamiah to point out what accounts in the Palace he wants and what entries in such accounts he requires to prove his case.	The Principal munsiff was informed in this office letter No 1076 of 7-12-06 of the inability of the Palace officer to comply with the requisition of the Principal munsiff.

No.	Court requisition	Palace answer.
10	The Principal Munsiff sent another summons to be served on the Palace officer to appear in person in the Court. (Vide letter No. 383 of 9-1-1907).	The Palace officer attended the Court on 18-1-07.
11	In his yadi No. 1378 dated 1-4-07, the Principal Munsiff stated that the Palace officer did not appear to the Court on 22-3-07 and so the case was adjourned to 12-4-07.	Replied as follows:- (1). The Palace officer attended the Court on 18-1-07. (2). The Court was pleased to tell him then that a copy of the Written Statement filed by the plaintiff would be sent to enable him to have a further search made in the records. (2). The Palace officer was expecting the said reference, and so he deemed that his presence was not required on 22-3-07. (3). As the Palace officer had no personal knowledge of the matter, he may be excused from attending the Court
12	The Principal Munsiff, in his yadi No. 1 of 3rd July 07, furnished a copy of Written statement filed by the plaintiff and requested that defence may be furnished to him after taking necessary information from it.	The Principal Munsiff was informed in this office yadi No. 21 dated 4-7-07 that [illegible] if a specific requisition is made of the accounts required, arrangements will be made for the same being searched in the Palace records.
13	In reply, the Principal munsiff requested the Palace officer to appear in person on 6-9-07 as the Court cannot find out what records or accounts are required, and what not.	Replied as follows:- (No. 332 of 6-9-07). (1) In compliance with the Court requisition accounts as far as they were traceable in the Palace records (from information furnished in the execution case in question) were forwarded to the court with this office letter No. 1679 of 18-4-05. (2). The Palace officer was led by the Principal munsiff to understand that information as to how the plaintiff made out a credit balance would be furnished. This being yet due it is not possible to have any further search made in the Palace records. (3). The promised information may be furnished to take further action on this behalf

12

N 665 (A) Box 29 (4)

No.	Court requisitn.	Palace answer.
14	The Principal munsiff in his yadi No. 204 dated 26/28-10-07 furnished a copy of the petition submitted by Krishnaswamirao and requested that the information therein contained may be furnished before the hearing date, i.e. 1-12-07.	The Principal munsiff was informed in this office yadi No. 1037 D/30-10-07 that as the hearing date was very close, the information therein contained, cannot be furnished within that date and requested 10 days' time may be given for furnishing the required information. A Consolidated statement of the credits and the debits in the matter of the Vanjaraj Bahadur Agrahar work embodying the information available in the Palace ~~office~~ Treasury was forwarded to the Principal munsiff with this office letter No. 8199/4-12-07.

26/2/07

No 60 (B) Page [illegible]

Hasarvani Venkatappa's Case

No.	Court requisition	Palace answer
1	Letter No. 453 dated 3-4-07 from the Principal Munsiff asking to produce Special Cott accounts, &c. before the Court in connection with Hasarvani Venkatappa's case.	Informed that the accounts referred to being those relating to Palace Departmental affairs the permission of His Highness the Maharaja is necessary to comply with the requisition. (Vide No. 1825 Dt. 6-4-07)
2	Letter No. 533 Dt. 10-6-07 from the Principal Munsiff stating that the accounts referred to are said to be indispensable and so the gracious permission of His Highness may be obtained to send the accounts in question to the Court.	Extracts of accounts furnished with this office No. 2462 Dt. 29-6-07
3	Summons No. 1620 dated 28-8-07 from the Principal Munsiff requesting the production of certain Palace accounts through the Mokhkhana Mokhtesar.	Informed that as it is considered inexpedient and undesirable to produce the documents in question in a Public Court of Law, he may come over to the Palace office and see the accounts there himself. (Vide this office letter No. 4377 Dt. 20/23-9-07).
4	Yadi No. 225 Dt. 11-11-07 from the Principal Munsiff, Nagar, requesting to produce extracts of accounts of supplies made by Hasarvani Venkatappa to Palace Mokhkhana	Extracts of accounts furnished with this office yadi No. 538 Dt. 28-11-07.
5	Letter No. 338-9 dated 10-12-07 from the Principal Munsiff, Nagar, forwarding summons in favor of Mokhkhana Sheristadar Krishnappa to produce supply accounts, &c. of Hasarvani Venkatappa.	The Principal Munsiff's attention was drawn to this office Nos. 437 & 538 Dt. 20/23-9-07 & 28-11-07 respectively, and the reasons mentioned in this office No. 437 Dt. 20/23-9-07 were also repeated (Vide letter No. 8914 of 17-12-07).
6	Letter No. 256 dated 18-12-07 from the Principal Munsiff, Nagar, stating that as it is inconvenient for him to go personally to the Palace office to see the accounts he has appointed a respectable gentleman as commissioner to check in the Palace and requesting the Palace officer to allow the Commissioner to check the accounts.	Replied as follows:- (1) All Palace accounts are in the nature of personal and private accounts, they cannot be made available for Court purposes in cases to which the Palace is no party proper. (2) The utmost that can be done is to furnish certified copies or extracts of specific items required by the Court as a matter of course and the requisition of the Court in case under reference has already been complied with in this manner

No.	Court requisition	Palace answer.
7	Letter No. 301 dated 16/17 January 1908 from the Principal Munsiff, Mysore requesting that the number or quantity of each of the articles supplied every month and the total number or quantity supplied for the year 1901-02 may be entered in the list enclosed and sent to him. (List is appended at foot of this Note).	Informed that it is not convenient to comply with the requisition made and that every facility will be afforded to him to have a look at the accounts in question in the Palace office. (Vide this office letter No. 1240 dated 11/12-2-08).
8	Letter No. 347 dated 19-2-08 from the Principal Munsiff, Mysore stating that he will inspect the accounts in question in the Palace office on the 5th March 08.	The Principal Munsiff inspected the accounts in the Palace office on 5-3-08
9	Letter No. 394 dated 20-3-08 from the Principal Munsiff, Mysore requesting the Palace officer to allow the Commissioners appointed to check the accounts in question in the Palace office.	Informed that the request made cannot be complied with and that, if he wished, a tabular statement of supplies will be prepared and sent if it could be remunerated for (Vide this office No. 1485 D/24-3-08).
10	Letter No. 404 D/26-3-08 from the Principal Munsiff, Mysore stating that a list as proposed may be prepared by Mothikhana Sheristedar Krishnappa who will be paid a fee of Rupees ten.	Informed that necessary instructions have been issued to Sheristedar Krishnappa to prepare the list in question and that every endeavour will be made to have the work finished about the close of April. (Vide No. 1536 D/7-4-08). 2. The list in question was forwarded with this office letter No. 23 D/3/4-7-08)
11	Letter No. 418 D/6-4-08 from the Principal munsiff, Mysore, stating that only certain receipts were produced by Sheristedar Krishnappa and requesting that all receipts connected with the payments made to Harahvani Venkatappa may be sent to the Court for inspection.	Informed that every endeavour will be made to furnish an answer in regard thereto about the close of April 08. (Vide No. 1535 D/7-4-08) 2. Informed that certain Vouchers have been sent to Govt. Comptroller and so they are not available in the Palace. (Vide No. 23 dated 3/4-7-08)

No 60 (35) Page 9 (31)

No.	Court requisition	Palace answer
12	Letter No. 68 Dt 21-8-08 from the principal Munsiff, Nuppne, stating that he has personally told Sheristedar Krishnappa the further information required and requesting to let him know whether any sums have been paid to Venkatappa other than those mentioned in the extracts already furnished.	Informed that no information on the subject has yet been traced. 2. Sheristedar Krishnappa's representation are not clear. 3. If any more information is required he is requested to write it definitely
13	Letter M. 135 Dt 20-10-08 from the Principal Munsiff, Nuppne, requesting to return the Commission papers given to Sheristedar Krishnappa.	Commission papers returned with this office letter No. 746 dated 30-10-08

List referred to in Memo No (7) of above Record.

1. Palace Mothikhana accounts from 1st Febry 01 to Febry-02.
2. Supplies to gentlemen and togues on special occasions such as Dasara, Birth days, &c.
3. Special Establishment supplies made to the Pleasure Palace
4. Supplies to Ministers houses.
5. Gaddige Ammanavaru accounts
6. Any other supplies made by the Contractor during the said period.

Ans 2 to 6 vide Vol

Note (C) Page 1

Mr. Framji's loan account case.

No.	Courts requisition	Palace answer
1	Mysore Principal Munsiff's letter No. 1164 of 2-9-08 forwarding Summons calling for production of all correspondence and accounts in regard to Palace loan granted to Mr. Framji	Informed that the requisition in question being very general in nature it cannot be complied with. If any particular letters or account are required copies of such will be furnished provided they are of such a nature as to admit of its being done (Vide letter No. 416 of 7-9-08).
2	Mysore Principal Munsiff's letter No. 212 to 214 dated 28-10-08 repeating the request above made without any reference to Palace answer of 7-9-08.	The Principal Munsiff's attention was invited to this office No. 416 of 7-9-08 to which no answer has as yet been received. (Vide letter No. 765 of 2-11-08).
3	Mysore Principal Munsiff's letter No. 391 of 1-2-09 repeating the request above made without any reference to ~~answer given on 7-9-08 & 2-11-08~~ matter referred in letter of Palace Office No. 416 of 7-9-08.	The Principal Munsiff's attention was invited to this office Nos. 416 & 765 dated 7-9-08 & 2-11-08 respectively.
4	The Principal Munsiff without again paying heed to Palace Office letter of 7-9-08 No. 416 has issued new personal Summons to Palace Office: P. Munsiff's No. 4803 of 24/1/09.	Please see Palace Office - Submissions Note (On P.L. Munsiff's No. 4803) of this day's dated Sub. Separate Note No. 724 dated 26/2/09

MRA 26/2/09